DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 825 FL 013 917

AUTHOR Dole, Robert
TITLE Linguistic Interference in Immigrants' Interlanguage.
INSTITUTION Teachers of English as an Additional Language, Vancouver (British Columbia).
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 16p.; In its: TEAL Occasional Papers Volume 7, p69-83, 1983.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Journal Articles (080)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Error Patterns; Foreign Countries; *French; German; *Immigrants; *Interference (Language); *Multilingualism; Oral Language; Polish; *Second Language Learning; Spanish
IDENTIFIERS *Quebec

ABSTRACT

A study of the linguistic interference of nine multilingual immigrants to the Saguenay Peninsula of Quebec province examined three types of interference in their spoken English. They included: (1) interlingual interference from the mother tongue; (2) intralingual intrusion from structures and lexical items from within English in situations and grammatical contexts in which they are inappropriate; and (3) tertiary interference from the language of the community, French. Of the nine immigrants, three had German as their mother tongue, three had Polish, and three had Spanish. A secondary goal of the study was to establish the pedagogical implications emerging from any third language learning difficulties common to all three language groups or unique to each subject. Over a thousand idiosyncratic utterances in English of the nine individuals were analyzed, and errors were placed in the three interference categories. In all cases, interference from French was almost exclusively observable in lexical transfer with little influence on English syntax or morphology. Interlingual interference from the mother tongue was most predominant in the syntax of all subjects' performance in English, although occurring in lexis as well. Intralingual interference was almost the only source of error in morphology. Three principal pedagogical considerations were found: (1) the mother tongue has a strong influence on performance of third language learners, and teacher knowledge of the mother tongue would be helpful; (2) because the second language is an active source of lexical transfer, immigrants to Quebec are apt to transfer items directly from French to English; and (3) error analysis shows that communication can be made adequately despite all errors made, resulting in fossilization of errors and resistance to pedagogical intervention. Tables of errors are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

— TEAL Occasional Papers, Vol 7, 1983 —

Linguistic Interference in Immigrants' Interlanguage

Robert Dole

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Dole
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED240825

INTRODUCTION

The present study is based on a linguistic analysis of the spoken English of nine immigrants in the Saguenay Valley. As is well known, the Saguenay has the highest proportion of French speakers of any area in North America. This is the first pertinent characteristic shared by the nine subjects. The second is that they all learned English mostly from a live and authentic communicative exchange with native speakers of English or from other immigrants who had attained a sufficient mastery of English to enable them to communicate easily in English. The third common denominator among them is that their mother tongues were known by the researcher; there were three subjects who had German as their mother tongue, three with Polish and three with Spanish.

The purpose of the study was to delineate the nature of three types of linguistic interference in the performance of these nine immigrants in their spoken English. The first type of interference is interlingual interference from the mother tongue, which, for the sake of convenience, is simply called interlingual interference. The second type of interference is intralingual intrusion from structures and lexical items from within the English language in situations and grammatical contexts in which they are inappropriate. The third and final type of interference is that coming from the language of the community, which is French; it is referred to as tertiary language interference.

A secondary goal of the study was to establish what the pedagogical implications are that can be derived from an understanding of which third language learning difficulties are common to all nine immigrants, which ones are characteristic of each of the three linguistic groups, and which ones are limited to the individual subjects.

PREVIOUS WORK IN THIS AREA

To our knowledge, this is the first attempt made to study systematically the influence of two distinct languages on the learning of a third, let alone of such trilateral relationships coming from three particular linguistic groups. The province of Quebec offers a very fertile source for such investigations, since it has a sizeable immigrant community, with immigrants coming from many different parts of the world. What is more important, however, is that many immigrants in Quebec feel obliged to learn both official languages of Canada.

Much of the motivation to learn English by those immigrants living in the French province of Quebec has been their realistic assumption that English is the

FL013917

Robert Dole is a faculty member at the Université du Québec at Chicoutimi.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

lingua franca of North America as a whole and their desire to become assimilated to the North American way of life, for which knowledge of English would be vital. The motivation to learn French, on the other hand, has two very real thrusts in the context of the present study. First, there is the fact that the immigrants in question live in the Saguenay Valley, where English is considered more of a foreign language than it is in many continental European capitals. Secondly, there is the reality of the continuing Gallicization of business, education, and culture in the province of Quebec that has been of such singular importance in recent history. What is pertinent for the present study, then, and what makes it unique, is that we are dealing with people who have had strong, personal motivation to learn two second languages simultaneously, or one after the other. For them the task of learning to speak other languages has never been confined to achieving personal success in the classroom, but has been a matter of life and death survival among the many demands for assimilation and career success that confront them in their new lives in Quebec.

This is not to say, however, that no work has ever considered the role of a second language on the learning of a third language, but that important social factors make the present study the first of its kind. There are three articles that deal with this question, but from other perspectives. Dušková's (1969:25) analysis of errors made in English by her Czech students reveals interference of German among those who had previously studied German, which she dismisses as "negligible." Among the examples of such interference, she mentions syntactic transfers from the German, such as in the sentence, "What for a book is it"/"Was für ein Buch ist es," as well as problems with false cognates between English and German, such as *wo/who* and *wer/where*.

Vriendt (1972:49-50) analyzes the interference that comes from knowing Dutch among the French-speaking students of the Translators' and Interpreters' Institute in Mons (Belgium) in their learning of English and German. Vriendt concludes that the closer the two second languages are to each other, the greater is the facilitation in learning the receptive skills and the more likely the occurrence of interference in the productive skills. To be more precise, the French-speaking students who had previously learned Dutch show more interference from Dutch in speaking and writing German than they do in speaking and writing English, and yet have greater facility in understanding and reading German than they do with English.

Gulutsan (1976:309) is the third author who has dealt with the question of learning a third language. He reported that Ukrainian-speaking children in Alberta were found to be more motivated to learn French, and to have greater ease in learning it, than their unilingual English-speaking classmates. As in the two studies just mentioned, Gulutsan limits his inquiries to the academic situation of students learning a third language in the classroom, which is far removed from the present context of this study, which deals with what Corder calls "free-learning second language learners" (1971:154).

As for the question of interlingual interference from the mother tongue and its relative importance compared to intralingual interference from within the target language, the controversy surrounding this question has been one of the most

debated in the field of foreign language teaching since the Second World War. It would be presumptuous to attempt to summarize all the arguments that have gone into defending and attacking the two principal points of view on the subject. It would be easier, and more appropriate, simply to mention the extreme positions of each tendency and highlight their major aspects. The most extreme position of those who consider interference from the mother tongue to be the chief stumbling block to learning a second language is known as the *a priori*, or strong, version of the contrastive analysis hypothesis. Those who uphold this position believe that it is possible, by carefully comparing the various linguistic systems and subsystems of the mother tongue of the learner with those of the target language, to predict all the errors that the learner will be likely to make, and thus to create a learning program that will prevent precisely those errors, and thus all possible errors, from occurring. Robert Lado summarizes the basic assumption of this position with these words:

> We assume that the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult. The teacher who has made a comparison of the foreign language with the native language of the students will know better what the real learning problems are and can better provide for teaching them. He gains an insight into the linguistic problems involved that cannot easily be achieved otherwise.(1957:2)

Lee (1968) and Dulay and Burt (1972), to name but a few, were quick to point out that many of the errors observed in their students' performance in the target language could not be traced to an origin in their native language, and added that what was of most importance to foreign language teachers was not knowledge of what errors students might make, but the actual errors that they make and with which experienced teachers are already all too familiar.

The dissatisfaction with the contrastive analysis approach led to the error analysis approach. With it came an increasing emphasis on the intralingual source of errors and a shift of interest to the cognitive hypothesis-testing theory that corresponded to the general replacement of behaviourist assumptions by cognitivist ones in psychology. Linguists like Corder (1967), Nemser (1971) and Selinker (1972) placed a new value on the phenomenon of errors as being a potential source for understanding how learners go about learning foreign languages. Corder (1967:166) even speaks of errors as revealing the learner's "built-in syllabus" for learning the target language.

One example of an extreme attempt to underline intralingual errors to the virtual exclusion of considering an interlingual source for language learning difficulties is Richards' (1971) article entitled "A Noncontrastive Approach to Error Analysis." Without so much as naming the mother language of the learners who commit certain errors, he claims that, because they come from a wide variety of sources, they must all have their origin in intralingual hypothesis testing. Although each error he mentions may have analogous errors committed by other learners and may belong to a specific category, the fact that neither

Richards nor his reader can examine the possibility of interlingual interference invalidates his "noncontrastive approach." Richards even includes as evidence of intralingual interference errors taken from other studies in which the same errors are classified as being of interlingual origin. One example of this is the omission of the definite article "before a noun modified by an *of*-phrase" in "Institute of Nuclear Physics" (p.122), which Richards borrows from Dušková's study ("I visited Institute of Nuclear Physics in Ljublana") (1969:18), despite the fact that Dušková considers the origin of this error to be interlingual, since there are absolutely no articles in Czech, the mother tongue of the student who omitted the definite article in this instance.

To conclude this review of the existing literature on this subject, we should stress that what little exists on the subject of interference in the learning of a third language is based on studies made in contexts very different from our own. The comparison of interlingual and intralingual interference, on the other hand, has been marked all too often by an attempt to defend one second language learning theory or another.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Our research findings are based on nine corpora of idiosyncratic utterances, with a total of over one thousand entries. These idiosyncratic utterances, or errors, were obtained in the course of tape-recorded sessions that the researcher held with the nine subjects. The subjects were asked to speak in English on whatever topics they chose, and the researcher limited his own interventions to the very minimum, without, however, sacrificing the give-and-take that is natural to any spontaneous conversation.

For the purposes of the present review of the research project, it is convenient to divide the errors analyzed into three global categories, the first being those originating in the learners' second language, secondly those derived from mother tongue interlingual interference, and finally those resulting from intralingual interference. Descriptive details of these findings are provided in Appendix A.

a. In the cases of all the nine subjects, interference from French was almost exclusively to lexical transfer with little influence on their English syntax or morphology. From the data of the Spanish-speaking subjects, we find such examples of this lexical transfer from the French as

*They're not too *pressed* to send the forms

where the subject borrowed the French verbal expression, "Ils ne sont pas tellement pressés." The Spanish equivalent would be, "No tienen prisa," in which the cognate is a noun, not a verb. Another Spanish-speaking subject said:

*The trip *arrived* the same week as my trip to Chile

in which the verb is an obvious transfer from the French, "Le voyage est arrivé la même semaine que mon voyage au Chili." The Spanish would have been, "El viaje ocurrió," and thus was not the source for the error.

The Spanish subjects shared with the others a tendency to transfer lexical items from French to English if they had a cognate in their native language. An example is the sentence

*We made a *demand* for an application form.

The standard English equivalent would have been, *a request*, or simply, *we asked for an application form*. The word *demand*, inappropriate in this context, could be a lexical transfer from either the French second language word, *une demande*, or from the native language of the speaker, *una demanda* (which can be used as well as *una petición*).

The same phenomenon can be found among the German-speaking subjects. One said once

*You must ask him for an *explication*.

which is a transfer of the French word *explication* in place of the standard English equivalent, *explanation*. There is no interference of the mother tongue here, since the German translation would be *Erklärung*. The same subject also said

*You *inscribe* for the course

when she meant to say, "You register for the course." The verb is another lexical transfer from the French *s'inscrire*.

Germans also make lexical transfers of words that are cognates in French and German. They thus talk about *hypothecs* instead of *mortgages*, since the French word *hypothèque* is reinforced by the German word *hypothek*. One German-speaking subject offered coffee by saying, "Serve yourself," instead of the normal English, "Help yourself." "Serve yourself" is a literal translation of both the French equivalent, "Sers-toi," and of the mother language, "Bediene dich."

The Polish subjects also make lexical transfers from French while speaking English. One talked about the

**urgency* entrance of the hospital

when she meant to say *emergency entrance*. The Polish equivalent would have been *wejście na pogotowie*. The same subject once said that someone

*wants a piece of *glace*

when she was thinking of *ice*. Once again, there is no interference from Polish here, which would translate *piece of ice* by *kawałek lodu*.

The Poles also use French words in English because of their similarity to Polish words. Polish has borrowed many lexical items from French (especially during the Napoleonic period). The following sentence contains two such bilingual transfers. The subject meant to say: "Their caps are connected to their suits," talking about children's winter suits. She actually said:

*Their *casques* are connected to their *combinaisons*.

If one did not know Polish, one would be tempted to assume that the sentence is simply a partial Anglicization of the French sentence

Leurs casques sont connectés à leurs combinaisons.

The source of error, however, could just have easily been interlingual interference from Polish, as the Polish translation of the sentence makes clear:

Ich *kaski* są połączone z *kombinezonami*.

There was an interesting counter-phenomenon among our Polish subjects, and that was their tendency to allow lexical interference from French when their native language has a cognate word with English, or even a loan word from English. An example of such a cognate is found in the Polish sentence

Robili *eksperymenty* z myszami.

One of our Polish subjects expressed exactly the same idea in English with this sentence:

*They made *experiences* with mice

when she meant to say, *experiments*, thus betraying a Gallic interference in a situation where Polish and English have cognate nouns.

An example of an English loan word in Polish is *grejpfrut*. Thus it is a paradox to realize that a Polish subject said

*We should buy a *pamplemousse*,

with an obvious transfer from French. This exemplifies what Juhász (1970:99) calls "die homogene Hemmung," or the inhibition that comes from finding homogenous forms in the mother tongue and the target language. It were as though the learner thinks of his native language as being so distinct from all others that he cannot admit any similarity between it and the foreign language that he is learning. He thus seeks out a truly foreign word from a third language to prevent having to use a cognate word from his mother tongue while speaking in the target language.

b. Interlingual interference from the mother tongue is most predominant in the syntax of all the nine subjects' performance in English, although its influence is present as well in the lexis of the subjects, as has just been seen.

From the corpus of errors of a Spanish-speaking subject we can cite the following example that contains two instances of syntactic interference from the mother tongue in one sentence:

*This course allowed me to understand much better the television.

The standard English model for this sentence is:

This course allowed me/enabled me to understand television much better.

The Spanish replica would be:

Este curso me permitió entender mucho mejor la televisión.

The first error is the presence of the definite article before *television*, which obviously has its origin in the use of the definite article in Spanish. The word order in English is also a reproduction of the Spanish word order which, unlike English, admits adverbial phrases (*much better/mucho mejor*) between the verb and its object.

Anyone who knows German can easily recognize the German origin of the interlingual interference in the following sentence:

*When they would ask, everybody would bring something.

The English model sentence would be:

If they asked, everybody would bring something.

The actual utterance is a literal translation of the German equivalent sentence

Wenn sie fragen würden, würde jeder etwas mitbringen.

Würde/würden are the translations of *would*, thus explaining why the sentence as spoken by our subject has contingency in both the apodosis clause and the protasis clause, as is done in German. The substitution of *if* by *when* is also due to German influence, since German has only one word for the two, *wenn*, which is phonetically more similar to *when* than to *if*.

The most outstanding feature of the Polish data is the inordinate number of errors made involving articles. This is in marked contrast to the Spanish and German corpora, where there are practically no errors at all in the use of articles. The difficulty that Poles, and all Slavs, have with articles is obviously due to the fact that there are no articles in any Slavic language. The semantic value carried

by articles is expressed, if at all, by the elaborate system of noun declensions in the Slavic languages. An example of the problem with articles plus the transfer of Polish word order is the following sentence, in which the subject was talking about sewing curtains:

*First we have to do in hands sides.

The model English sentence would be

First we have to do the sides by hand.

The error with the article, the word order error, the erroneous preposition and the erroneous use of the plural in *hands*, all have their origin in interlingual interference from the Polish replica sentence

Najpierw misimy obrębić w rękach boki.

Approximately eighty percent of the syntactic errors in all the nine corpora have their origin in interlingual interference from the mother tongue.

c. Intralingual interference from within the target language is practically the only source of error in terms of morphology. By intralingual interference is meant the use of English structures and grammatical rules in inappropriate contexts.

The following sentences are examples of errors in morphology that could have been made by any of our subjects, since the errors come from the English language system itself. The native language of the subject who said the sentence is given in parentheses to show how such errors are shared by speakers of many different languages:

*In Chile not everybody *have* a car. (Spanish)

*My son *have* a boy. (German)

*This *have* something to do with burning. (Polish)

In the three preceding errors, the use of *have* for *has* must be considered as an intralingual overgeneralization of the unmarked infinitive form and thus a type of facilitation in speaking English.

Another type of intralingual overgeneralization that is common to members of the three different linguistic communities under consideration is the overextension of the regular *-ed* preterite ending. The following three sentences illustrate this phenomenon:

*I *speaked* to you about my family. (Spanish)

*My son *catched* him. (German)

*I did my laundry and *hanged* it. (Polish)

The exclusively intralingual source of morphological errors allows us to hypothesize that speakers of different languages have little trouble distinguishing which morpheme belongs to which language. We have no examples whatsoever of any of our subjects inserting a morpheme from either their native language or from the second language in their performance in English. Further examples of all three error types are given in Appendix B.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

There are three principal pedagogical implications to be made from the research findings. The first is that the mother tongue most definitely has a very strong influence on the performance of learners of an additional language. A corollary to this premise is that it would behoove teachers to know the native language of their students, whenever possible. Only if the teacher knows German, for example, will he understand why his German students continue to say, "I was yesterday there," while speaking English, or "J'étais hier là," while speaking French, although they never heard such sentences made by native speakers of the target language in question. The teacher who knows German will immediately recognize that the student has transferred the German sequence of temporal adverb before local adverb to a language in which the normal order is just the reverse. To the extent that our findings reveal as high as eighty percent interlingual interference in the syntax of our students' performance in the target language, our study confirms the basic assumptions of the contrastive analysis hypothesis.

The second implication of our findings is that the second language of the students is an active source of lexical transfer and that, therefore, the teacher should bear in mind that immigrant students in Quebec are quite apt to transfer lexical items directly from French to English. One can assume that the same is true of immigrants being taught French in areas of diglossia like Montreal and to a lesser extent in other parts of the province. Second language teachers in Quebec should realize that their immigrant students, almost without exception, are highly motivated to learn both of Canada's official languages, and that the more unbalanced the immigrant's experience of these two new languages is, the greater will be the tendency to borrow lexemes from the better-known language while speaking the other.

The third and final pedagogical implication to be derived from our research findings is a rather pessimistic one. It has been demonstrated to us over and over again that the nine immigrant subjects have all developed a degree of fluency in English that permits them to communicate to their satisfaction with others who speak English in Quebec. The thousand-odd errors that we analyzed proved that communication can be made adequately despite all the lexical, syntactic and morphological errors that slip in. Since communication is achieved through the

idiosyncratic dialects of these immigrants, there is naturally less motivation to make their speech more homogeneous with standard English. There seems to be, as a result, a great deal of fossilization of errors and a consequent resistance to whatever pedagogical intervention might be indicated. Immigrant speech, on the one hand, should be the envy of most second language teachers because it demonstrates how successful human beings can be in using a second language for their communication needs. On the other hand, however, it presents a frustrating phenomenon to second language teachers because it places a clear limit on what teachers can expect to do. Certainly, most school teachers hope that their students will learn to speak the target language as well as most immigrants do. But at the same time, they may be discouraged to see how futile are their attempts to eliminate the fossilized errors that characterize the speech of the typical immigrant.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of over one thousand errors in the spoken English of German, Polish and Spanish immigrants living in the most predominantly French area of Quebec, the Saguenay Valley, reveals that interference from French is observable almost exclusively in lexical choice, that syntactical errors are due, in the great majority of cases, to interlingual interference from the mother tongue, and that morphological errors have their origin, among all the subjects studied, in intralingual overgeneralizations.

It is further concluded that it would be well for the second language teachers of immigrants to be aware of the multifarious linguistic influences on their students' performance in the target language, while not entertaining any illusions about the potential effectiveness of pedagogical intervention aimed at eradicating the errors that have become fossilized in immigrants' speech without preventing them from communicating successfully.

REFERENCES

Corder, S. Pit. 1967. The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 5*, 2-3:161-170.

_____ . 1971. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 9*, 2:147-159.

Dulay, Heidi C. and Marina K. Burt. 1972. Goofing: An indicator of children's second language learning strategies. *Language Learning 22*, 2:235-252.

Dušková, Libuše. 1969. On sources of errors in foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 7*, 1:11-36.

Gulutsan, Matro. 1976. Third language learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review 32*, 3:309-315.

Juhász, János. 1970. *Probleme der Interferenz*. Munich: Max Hueber.

Lado, Robert. 1957. *Linguistics across Cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lee, W.R. 1968. Thoughts on contrastive linguistics in the context of language teaching. *Report of the 19th Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. James E. Alatis (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Nemser, W. 1971. Approximative systems of foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 9*, 2:115-123.

Richards, Jack C. 1971. A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *English Language Teaching 25*, 3:204-219.

Selinker, Larry. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 10*, 3:209-231.

Vriendt, S. 1972. Interferenzen einer ersten Fremdsprache beim Erlernen einer zweiten. Papers from the International Symposium of Applied Contrastive Linguistics, Stuttgart, October 11-13, 1971. Gerhard Nickel (Ed.). Bielefeld: Cornelsen-Velhagen und Klasing.

APPENDIX A

Table 1: Relative Frequency of Morphosyntactic Error Categories

Table 1 shows the relative frequency of all the 938 morphosyntactic errors that were analyzed. The errors are divided into eighteen categories, which are listed in rank order. The absolute numbers of errors, as well as their percentages, are given for both the entire group of all nine subjects and the three sub-groups of subjects speaking the same mother tongue. The category called "all verbal errors" actually contains the sub-categories labeled "verb morphology," "auxiliary verbs," "verbal aspect," "verb tenses," "infinitives," "modal verbs," "gerunds," and "verbal voice." The category, "nouns, other than morphology," refers to such errors as the simple omission of nouns or their substitution by other parts of speech.

Table 1

Rank	Category	Total	% of Grand Total	% of German Total	% of Polish Total	% of Spanish Total
1.	all verbal errors	330	35.2	47	29	35.2
2.	verb morphology	169	18	27	13	19.5
3.	articles	155	16.5	0.4	28	11.6
4.	word order	136	14.5	13.1	17	14.5
5.	prepositions	130	13.9	12.7	14	15.1
6/7/8	noun morphology	52	5.5	5.9	2.4	10.8
6/7/8	pronouns	52	5.5	10	3.5	5.2
6/7/8	auxiliary verbs	52	5.5	5.9	5.3	5.6
9.	adjectives	38	4.1	4	3	6
10/11	verbal aspect	32	3.4	2.1	4.7	2.4
10/11	verb tenses	32	3.4	5.9	2	3.6
12.	adverbs	31	3.3	5	2.6	2.7
13.	infinitives	20	2.1	1	2.2	2.8
14.	modal verbs	14	1.5	3.7	0.4	1.2
15/16	conjunctions	12	1.3	2	1.1	1.2
15/16	nouns, other than morphology	12	1.3	0.4	2.4	0
17.	gerunds	7	0.7	1	0.4	0.8
18.	verbal voice	4	0.4	0	0.8	0

Table 2: Frequency of Sources for the Morphosyntactic Errors

This table shows the frequency of the different sources attributed to the morphosyntactic errors, giving both the absolute numbers and the percentages. These statistics are given for both the three language groups and the entire group of subjects. The category called "Interlingual totals" includes four sub-categories: "overt" indicates those errors that involve a direct transfer from the mother tongue; "covert" means those errors that are due to a difference existing between the equivalent structures in the target language and the mother tongue, without there being a direct transfer from the latter to the former; "+ tertiary language" refers to those errors for which two hypotheses are advanced, one giving an interlingual source for the error and the other, a transfer from the tertiary language; "+ intralingual," in a similar way, represents the combination of two hypotheses, one for an interlingual origin and the other for an intralingual one.

Table 2

	German No.	%	Polish No.	%	Spanish No.	%	All together number	%
interlingual totals	109	46	333	74	119	47	561	59.7
overt	93	39	219	49	71	28.3	383	40.8
covert	15	6	106	24	21	8.4	142	15.1
≠ tertiary lang.	1	0.4	4	0.9	25	10	30	3.2
≠ intralingual	0	0	4	0.9	2	0.8	6	0.6
intralingual	109	46	85	19	73	29.1	267	28.5
tertiary lang.	3	1	5	1	3	1.2	11	1.2
intralingual ≠ L3	0	0	4	0.9	22	8.8	26	2.8
nonce	16	7	23	5	21	8.4	60	6.4

Table 3: Frequency of Sources for the Lexical Errors

Table 3 gives the frequency, in terms of both absolute numbers and percentages, for the lexical errors of the nine subjects, considered first within their language groups and then within the entire group. The category called "interlingual ≠ L3" refers to those errors for which two hypotheses were advanced, one giving an interlingual source from the mother tongue as the presumed source, and the other giving interference from the tertiary language.

Table 3

	German No.	%	Polish No.	%	Spanish No.	%	Entire Group No.	%
interlingual	31	53	25	30	21	22	77	33
tertiary lang.	14	24	19	23	39	41	72	30
interlingual ≠ L3	4	2	16	19	22	23	42	17
intralingual	6	10	20	24	4	4	30	13
nonce	3	5	3	4	10	10	16	7
total	58		83		96		237	

APPENDIX B

Additional Examples of the Three Error Sources

A. Tertiary Language Errors (from French)

1. I hope my *stage* won't mess up my plans. (teaching practice)
2. He has something wrong with his *basin*. (pelvis)
3. I can't *assist* the meeting. (attend)
4. He has three *locators*. (tenants)
5. Is the auditorium *caisse* open? (box office)
6. I need to sew a *robe*. (dress)
7. It's four *pieces* and a half. (rooms)
8. She was trying to beat him with a *balai*. (broom)
9. Then I worked for the *ambassade*. (embassy)
10. They didn't have any *syndicate*. (union)

B. Interlingual Errors

1. It went off *good*. (well) German replica: Es ist *gut* verlaufen.
2. He had *one time* some clear wine. (once) Er hatte *einmal* reinen Wein.
3. Those words *who* you don't hear so often. (which) Die Wörter, *die* man nicht so oft hört. (The German relative pronoun, *die*, can be used for both persons and things.)
4. We should find out *what are neighbors*. (what the neighbors are like) Polish replica: Powinniśmy dowiedzieć się jacy są siedzi. (The Polish replica reveals the interlingual origin of the three morphosyntactic errors: the word order, the lack of the article, and the absence of an equivalent word for *like*.)
5. You have to send them early so they would get *∅*. (get them) Muszisz wysłać je wcześnie żeby zdążyli dostać. (no equivalent for the second *them*.)

6. *We* enjoy with Robert the tequilla. (I am enjoying the tequilla with Robert.) Z przyjemnością pijemy z Robertem tekillę. (In Polish, the first person plural pronoun and/or verb forms are often used when referring to oneself in a plural context.)

7. When she will come? (When will she come?) Kiedy ona przyjedzie? (The word order can be the same in declarative and interrogative sentences in Polish.)

8. Spain changes *his* attitudes. (its) Spanish replica: España cambia sus actitudes. (The Spanish possessive adjective, *su/sus*, can be the equivalent of *its, his, her,* or *their* (or even *your* with the polite *usted* form.)

9. My father was ∅ teacher. (a teacher) Mi padre era profesor.

10. I want to teach *to the* children. (teach children) Quiero enseñar *a los* niños.

C. Intralingual Errors

1. You should be happy he didn't *tore* it.

2. I don't think she would *stole* it.

3. What he *despise* in his wife is her greed.

4. I believe in strong *mens*.

5. I *catched* that.

6. He *come* from Norway.

7. She *die* when I was twenty years old.

8. You are somebody who *have* lots of imagination.

9. The other *speak* German.

10. She *want* to take the courses.